

RAPID TRANSIT DELAYED.

ADVERSE DECISION OF THE APPELLATE
DIVISION OF THE SUPREME COURT.

THE MOTION TO CONFIRM THE REPORT OF THE
SPECIAL COMMISSION DENIED, ALL THE
JUDGES CONCURRING—THE QUESTION

ERED—NO APPEAL POSSIBLE.

city for a long time to come was destroyed by a decision which was handed down yesterday by the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court. The Board of Rapid Transit Commissioners failed to get the consent of property-owners in Broadway for the proposed underground railroad, and the General Term of the Supreme Court appointed a special commission, consisting of Frederic O. Coudert, George Sherman and William H. Geldenhorn, to take testimony and report upon the advisability of building the road according to the routes which had been laid out and the plan which had been adopted. The special commission some time ago reported in favor of building

tion of the Supreme Court to confirm the report of the special commission, A. B. Boardman and Edward M. Shepard, argued the case for the Rapid Transit Commissioners, and Elihu Root, Franklin Bartlett and other lawyers opposed the motion. In the decision announced yesterday the motion was denied.

Two opinions on the subject were handed down. Presiding Justice Van Brunt wrote one opinion, and all other Justices of the court concurring. In which the report of the special commission is criticised and disagreed with mainly on the ground that questions of the possible cost of the underground railroad were not properly considered. The other opinion, written by Justice Rummel, says, all the other Justices of the court concurring, that the plans did not provide for a complete

City officials, lawyers and members of the Board of Rapid Transit Commissioners said yesterday that there could be no appeal from the decision, because no questions of law or constitutional questions were raised in the opinions, but only questions of fact, and a decision of the Ap-

tion of fact cannot be reviewed by the Court of Appeals. The Board of Rapid Transit Commissioners will meet on Monday to face the situation but they may not decide to turn their attention to

The opinion of Presiding Justice Charles H. Van

The Board of Rapid Transit Commissioners, who have adopted a route and general plan for the new line, and having failed to obtain the consent of the property-owners along the line of the proposed railway, made application to the General Term for the appointment of commissioners as provided for in the Rapid Transit act, and on March 1, 1896, the General Term, after three commissioners to determine and report, after due hearing, whether the railway should be authorized to be constructed and operated, and the route and general plan should be determined upon by the said Board and the commissioners, and the property-owners should be required to consent to the construction and operation of the railway, having proceeded with the hearing of the matters referred to them, on March 1, 1896, reported to this court that they were of the opinion that the proposed railway should be

the route proposed by the Board of Rapid Transit Commissioners ought to be adopted, and that the railway determined upon by said Board ought to be constructed.

The commissioners, after spending much time in taking of testimony in regard to the question of the cost and the manner of building and operating the railroad in question, and having frankly stated in their report that any conclusion which they could arrive at in respect to the probable cost would be mere conjecture, seem to have cut the Gordian knot by setting aside entirely the question of their sole looking upon the questions referred to them, as engineering problems. It is the first time, as

the question of practicability did not include the consideration of cost. More than eighteen hundred years ago it was said, "For which of you, intending to build a tower, sitteth down first and counteth the cost, whether he have sufficient to finish it? lest when he hath laid the foundation, and is begun to build, and saith, I will build a tower, and cannot finish it, he shall be laughed at. Every one that hath forsaken these things, and hath taken upon him, saying, This man began to build, and was not able to finish."*

It is well known that there is no problem which a winning science cannot solve. The only problem is to find the right question to ask and the right method to meet the expense.

But it is urged upon the part of the opponents of this scheme that the proposed plan is a "fallacy" because they have no interest in the determination of that question. It is apparent that this is not the case, because the Government is apparently taking the position that it is not going to interfere with the use and abuse of the construction owners to the extent that the Government will necessarily involve is that it can be done. It is not necessary to say that the Government will be completed with the construction of the project. If there is a probability after the construction of this road, it is a fact that no man can compute, and it is a fact that the construction is absolutely abandoned because of the constitutional prohibitions. It is manifest that great injury will result to the project of abolishing owners of the project.

In reaching the conclusion arrived at, the committee has been guided by the fact that the court seeks to justify them by reference to the language of the General. When a former speaker of the House of Representatives seems to have lost sight of the fact that the plan now seeking our sanction differs in every way from the plan which the court, in the case formerly before the General Term all that it was necessary for the committee to do was to take such security as was

course of the work in case the contractor failed to comply with his contract. The court says that its opinion is based on the fact that the question was simply a financial one and that it might safely assume that the commissioners would take sufficient security at least to put the street in a safe condition. It adds that the contractor to complete the work and that if capitalists would at their own risk undertake the enterprise they should be allowed to do so.

AN ENTIRELY DIFFERENT CASE.

In the case at bar, however, the problem is absolutely different. It is the city's money which is to be spent. And it is to be observed that in view of the obligations already incurred by the city for work in progress it is difficult to see how money can

the cost of this work. In consequence of the constitutional prohibition against the creation of debt, and if the work was commenced it would be impossible for the city to raise funds necessary for its completion and the work must cease although incomplete and absolutely useless.

It may be said that the city is not to be protected and that the Commissioners will take sufficient security from the party contracting with the city to construct this railway upon its behalf. But if our Commissioners are to be authorized to contract to be constructed for \$500,000 or \$2,000,000, after spending months in investigating this subject—as they have reported—upon what basis are the

has also been suggested that the increase in value of the property will give an opportunity to create a debt, but this increase will be a matter of time and the contracts for construction must be made now, the obligation must be entered into now and it cannot be postponed until a later date. Consequently the limit can only be considered.

THE CITY'S RISK.

It is to be observed that the moneys for this enterprise must be furnished by the city, the risk is really that of the city, and it would seem having in view the other obligations of the city, unless the road can be built for a substantially less amount than the engineers estimate, the work must stop and the city would not have the right to borrow money enough to put the streets in the condition it

millions of dollars in a vain attempt to carry out this scheme of rapid transit. If our Commissioners are unable to ascertain within \$40,000,000 what the